

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the claims**

Claims 1-104 were pending in the application prior to the filing of this response. Claims 23-52 and 102-104 have been allowed by the Examiner. The Examiner has further objected to claims 21, 73 and 95, and claims 1-20, 22, 53-72, 74-94 and 96-101 stand rejected.

None of the currently pending claims have been amended or canceled in this response. As a result, no new matter has been introduced by this request for reconsideration.

**II. Allowable Claims**

Claims 23-52 and 102-104 have been allowed by the Examiner.

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 23-52 and 102-104.

**III. Objection to Claims**

Claims 21, 73 and 95 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 21, 73 and 95, and reserve the right to make amendments involving these claims at a later time.

**IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-20, 22, 53-72, 74-94 and 96-101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,144,962 to Weinberg et al. (hereafter, "Weinberg"). More specifically, the rejection argues that Weinberg anticipates each and every limitation in claims 1-20, 22, 53-72, 74-94 and 96-101.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's application of Weinberg in this rejection. Weinberg is a system for facilitating the analysis and management of websites and website content (abstract). The Weinberg system automatically gathers information from existing websites for displaying in a graphical form (column 2, lines 10-26). This information

may be displayed in a visual mapping configuration, wherein central web site pages are surrounded with child elements, and each web page group is connected by a line indicating how the various pages are linked (see, for example, FIG. 1). All of the information is automatically generated in accordance with the abilities of the software (column 7, line 48-column 8, line 8).

The rejection argues that each and every aspect of the aforementioned claims is anticipated, however, Applicants contend that at least the “user” initiated aspects of the present invention, as claimed, are neither recited nor implied in Weinberg. For example, claim 1 recites: “receiving a user instruction for initiating creation of the new node via a user interface,” and “receiving node information from the user,” which is missing from the Weinberg system. The Examiner relies upon column 2, lines 27-67 and FIG. 2 of the Weinberg reference, wherein a description of the mapping layout in the Weinberg visualization engine is described. This description also explains that the size of a node may be indicative of the number of links going out from each node. Nowhere in this description does it recite or imply that any of the visualization mapping information originates from a user. On the contrary, it appears that the display creation is totally automated in Weinberg, and that at no point is information provided by a user in order to create the visual layout of the mapped website (see for example, column 7, line 48-column 8, line 8 and column 9, line 19-column 19, line 15). More specifically, a user may only interact with the visualization after it has been automatically created, however, no user information is utilized during the actual creation of any of the elements within the web site map.

As a result, at least the above-identified elements of claim 1 are neither recited nor implied in Weinberg. Further, dependent claims 4-7 also appear to be distinguishable because they also include limitations related to the handling of information provided by user input. A user in Weinberg may change the way a map is displayed by implementing filtering

(column 16, lines 21-52), but they cannot add a new node to the map or change a name of a node (as recited in claims 4 and 5), since all of these aspects are automatically derived from an existing website through well-known “webcrawling” methods (column 2, lines 10-26). Further, while Weinberg can “automatically update” the map of the website to automatically identify what content in the original website may have changed, it cannot identify when content being added by a user already exists (as recited in claim 7) since, as previously discussed, there is no ability for a user to manually add information to the display mapping. These same arguments also apply to claim 10, which further requires receiving indication of an attachment type from the user. The Examiner relies on column 19, lines 20-34 of Weinberg to reject claim 10, but this section seems unrelated to claim 10, and only discusses plug-ins for software disclosed therein.

As a result, Applicants assert that at least claims 1, 4-7 and 10 are distinguishable from Weinberg for the reasons set forth above. Claims 2,3 and 8-20 and 22 depend from claim 1, and therefore are also distinguishable. Independent claims 53 and 75 are also distinguishable because they have similar limitations to claim 1 as they apply to various systems. The balance of the aforementioned rejected claims depend from claims 53 and 75. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that all of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of the application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4030. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4030. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: January 3, 2007

By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Elliot L. Frank  
Registration No. 56,641  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101